

PRESENT: Ted Dziurman Mark Stimac
Rick Kessler Pam Pasternak
Bill Need
Bill Nelson
Frank Zuazo

Motion by Need
Supported by Nelson

Years: All - 5

ITEM #2 – VARIANCE REQUESTED. JUDY KENNEDY OF GULF INTEREST, INC., CEDAR RIDGE CONDOMINIUMS, BIG BEAVER EAST OF JOHN R., for relief of Chapter 83 to construct a 6' high privacy fence in a front setback.

Judy Kennedy of Gulf Interest, Inc. was present and stated that there were several reasons they wished to put up a privacy fence in this area. Ms. Kennedy stated that this fence would actually be along the back yard of the units to be built. Ms. Kennedy also stated that the fence would be setback 15' from the property line and on the north side of the greenbelt and will be partially screened by a 2 ½' to 3' high berm. Ms. Kennedy further indicated that they have received landscape approval from Ron Hynd and they are planning to add in excess of 50 different trees, shrubs and evergreens that will also help to keep the visual impact of this fence to a minimum along Big Beaver. Ms. Kennedy also said that not only will this fence help to protect the privacy of these homeowners, but will also help to buffer the noise from the traffic on Big Beaver.

ITEM #2

Mr. Need asked who would be responsible for the upkeep of the fence and Ms. Kennedy indicated that the maintenance is part of the master deed and dues will be paid by the homeowners in order to provide the Homeowner's Association with the funding necessary for the maintenance of this fence. Mr. Need asked if separate gates would be provided for the upkeep of the greenbelt area and Ms. Kennedy again stated that the maintenance of the greenbelt area would be the responsibility of the Homeowner's Association not the individual home owners.

Mr. Zuazo asked Ms. Kennedy if the lots on the north end of this subdivision are the same size as the lots on the south side and Ms. Kennedy stated that when considering the lot area apart from the greenbelt easement that they are both 135' deep.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Nancy Aguinaga of 2352 Orpington was present and stated that she is opposed to a wooden privacy fence. Ms. Aguinaga stated that she has been a Troy resident for 25 years and believes that although wooden privacy fences look nice when they are first put in, after a period of time, they become unsightly due to lack of maintenance. Ms. Aguinaga stated that she would not be opposed to either a brick wall or vinyl privacy fencing. Ms. Aguinaga was concerned about the upkeep of the fence.

Ms. Kennedy replied that they feel that the maintenance of the fence would be properly handled and was not concerned that the fence would deteriorate. Ms. Kennedy further stated that the maintenance of the fence would be mandated through the master deed and homeowners would pay their fees up front and the required maintenance of the fence would be taken from a working capital fund. Ms. Kennedy also stated that the price of the fencing has to be taken into consideration, and Ms. Aguinaga confirmed that the starting price of these homes would be \$290,000.00.

Mr. Need asked if the petitioner had investigated the possibility of putting up vinyl fencing in lieu of wooden fencing, and Ms. Kennedy stated that she did not believe they would be absolutely opposed to this idea, but would need to look into it. Mr. Need then asked Mr. Stimac if the Building Department had any opinions regarding the use of vinyl fencing and Mr. Stimac stated that we have had several residents install vinyl fencing and they have indicated that they require very little maintenance and present a very uniform look. Ms. Aguinaga stated that her daughter-in-law has had vinyl fencing around their pool for at least ten (10) years and it still has the appearance of being almost brand new.

No one else wished to be heard and the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Need asked if Ms. Kennedy had a picture of the proposed fencing and Ms. Kennedy said that she did not, however, she thought it would be a shadow type of privacy fence.

ITEM #2

Mr. Stimac indicated that the plans provided showed a board-on-board type of fencing, which would give the effect of a solid fence.

There is one written objection on file. There are no written approvals on file.

Motion by Need
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to table the request of Judy Kennedy of Gulf Interest, Inc., Cedar Ridge Condominiums, for relief of Chapter 83 to construct a 6' high privacy fence in the front setback along E. Big Beaver until the meeting of August 1, 2001.

- To allow the petitioner the opportunity to investigate the use of vinyl privacy fence rather than a wooden fence.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO TABLE REQUEST UNTIL THE MEETING OF AUGUST 1, 2001 CARRIED

ITEM #3 – VARIANCE REQUESTED. LYND R. ALLEN, 2245 ALEXANDER, for relief of Chapter 83 to erect a 42" high fence in the front yard setback along Paris.

Mr. Stimac explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 83 to erect a 42" high fence in a front yard setback. This lot is a double front corner lot, in that it has a front yard on both Alexander and Paris. Chapter 83 limits the height of fences to 30" in that portion of the property in front of the building setback line. The site plan submitted indicates a 42" high picket fence in the front setback along Paris.

Ms. Joanne Allen was present and stated that she wished to put up this non-obscuring fence along the easement next to her property. Ms. Allen brought in pictures of the easement, which had not been mowed, as well as pictures of her lot and the type of fence she wished to erect.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing. No one wished to be heard and the Public Hearing was closed.

There are four (4) written approvals on file. There is one (1) written objection on file and one (1) partial objection on file.

Mr. Dziurman stated that Ms. Allen was a personal friend of his and would abstain from voting on this issue.

ITEM #3

Motion by Nelson

Supported by Zuazo

MOVED, to grant Lynd R. Allen, 2245 Alexander, relief of Chapter 83 to erect a 42" high fence in the front yard setback along Paris.

- Variance is not contrary to public interest.
- This fence will not obscure on coming traffic.

Yeas: 4 – Nelson, Need, Kessler, Zuazo

Abstain: 1 - Dziurman

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE CARRIED

ITEM #4 – VARIANCE REQUESTED. WILLIAM N. NICHOLS, 1080 MINNESOTA, for relief of Chapter 83 to replace an existing 6' high privacy fence with a new 6' high privacy fence in the front yard setback along Wisconsin.

Mr. Stimac explained that the petitioner is requesting relief of Chapter 83 to replace an existing 6' high privacy fence with a new 6' high privacy fence. This lot is a double front corner lot, in that it has a front setback along Minnesota and Wisconsin. As such, Chapter 83 limits the height of fences in front yard setbacks to 30" in height. The permit application submitted indicates a 6' high privacy fence in the front setback along Wisconsin. A review of the Building Department records, found no record of a fence permit for the existing fence.

Mr. and Mrs. Nichols were present and stated that they have lived in this home approximately 5 years and the fence that was there was falling apart and in need of repair. Mr. Nichols stated that they have three children and a large dog and wanted to fix the fence in order to protect their children as well as to protect other children from the dog. Mr. and Mrs. Nichols are concerned because there is a bus stop right near their property. Mr. Nichols stated that he did not realize that he needed a fence permit in order to repair the existing fence.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing. No one wished to be heard and the Public Hearing was closed.

There are eight (8) written approvals on file. There are no written objections on file.

Motion by Need

Supported by Nelson

ITEM #4

MOVED, to grant William Nichols, 1080 Minnesota, relief of Chapter 83 to replace an existing 6' high privacy fence with a new 6' high privacy fence in the front setback along Wisconsin.

- Variance is not contrary to public interest.
- A large number of neighbors approve of this privacy fence.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE CARRIED

ITEM #5 – VARIANCE REQUESTED. KASCO, INC. REPRESENTING WILLIAM BEAUMONT HOSPITAL, 44199 DEQUINDRE, for relief of the 1997 International Plumbing Code (IPC) Section 1107.2.

Mr. Stimac explained that the 1997 IPC requires that roof drainage systems be provided with a secondary drainage system that has piping and a point of discharge that is independent from the primary roof drains. It further requires that this secondary drainage discharge be at a location, above grade, where the building occupants would normally observe it. The petitioners are in the process of constructing an addition in an interior courtyard for radiation/oncology department at the existing Beaumont Hospital. The petitioners are proposing a secondary system that would be interconnected with the primary system within the building. They propose over sizing the primary system and installing alarms in the secondary system to notify the occupants if the overflow is receiving water. They are asking relief for this modified system.

Mr. Chet Schroeder of Beaumont Hospital and Mr. Michael N. Engle of Kasco Inc., as well as Scott Morgenstern of SSOE for Beaumont Hospital were present. Mr. Morgenstern stated that the area in question is an interior courtyard of the hospital and in order to comply with the Plumbing Code, they would have to route the drainage system through adjacent existing hospital spaces. Mr. Morgenstern explained that the secondary system would be equipped with alarms which would be tied in directly to the building's facility system program and would indicate when the primary system had failed. Mr. Morgenstern further explained that this area is surrounded by other sections of the hospital that are as much as seven (7) stories high and did not believe that the primary system would plug from leaves and debris. Mr. Morgenstern also indicated that the building is monitored twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week and if the system were to fail, steps would be taken quickly to correct this failure.

Mr. Stimac indicated that the main concern of the code is that if the primary system were to fail, the roof could collapse due to the weight of ponded water. Mr. Stimac also said that plans have been submitted which indicates that the roof structure can sustain up to 15" of ponded water. Mr. Stimac further pointed out that due to the fact that the

ITEM #5

roof of this area of the hospital was in a courtyard, it would be easily visible from surrounding areas.

Mr. Kessler asked how the alarm would indicate if there was a failure of the primary system, and Mr. Engle pointed out that if there were a problem a light would indicate that the system had failed in the building facility area.

Motion by Nelson
Supported by Kessler

MOVED, to grant Kasco, Inc., representing William Beaumont Hospital, 44199 Dequindre, 1st floor – Radiation/Oncology, relief of the 1997 International Plumbing Code (IPC) Section 1107.2 to install a primary drainage system which is over-sized and install alarms in the secondary system to notify the occupants if the overflow is receiving water.

- Variance is not contrary to public interest.
- System will be tested to make sure it works efficiently.

Yeas: All – 5

MOTION TO GRANT VARIANCE CARRIED

Mr. Need stated that Mr. Richnak would be taking his place for the Building Code Board of Appeals meeting of August 1, 2001 due to the fact that he will be on vacation, and Mr. Stimac also indicated that Ms. Norvell would be taking his place at the August meeting.

The Building Code Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 9:23 A.M.

MS/pp